UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,356	02/15/2007	Kiran K. Baikerikar	62657A	1717
109 7590 04/01/2011 The Dow Chemical Company EXAMINER				
P.O. BOX 1967	,	FLETCHER III, WILLIAM P		
2040 Dow Center Midland, MI 48641			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1715	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/01/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

FFUIMPC@dow.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/549,356	BAIKERIKAR ET AL.	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Examiner D. Flatabarrill	Art Unit	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	William P. Fletcher III	1715	
Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	ie correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply but will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS e, cause the application to become ABAND	ION. e timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 J 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under the condition of	s action is non-final. Ince except for formal matters,		
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-18 is/are pending in the at 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 is/are withdrawn 5) Claim(s) 9 and 15-18 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 7,8 and 11-14 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o 	from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Appli prity documents have been rec au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) ☐ Interview Sumn Paper No(s)/Ma 5) ☐ Notice of Inform		

Art Unit: 1715

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed 1/21/2011 is noted.

2. Claims 1-9 and 11-18 remain pending.

Election/Restrictions

3. Applicant's election with traverse of the method claims in the reply filed on 1/29/2010 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that examination of composition and method claims does not present an undue burden. This is not found persuasive because the burden on the examiner extends to the patentability issues associated with, and evolving as a result of, searching additional inventions. Issues related to a process are frequently very different from those related to a composition. For example, the issues related to the formulation requirements of a composition need not be familiar to an examiner of specific processes. Consequently, examination of process claims and composition claims presents a serious burden on the Primary Examiner both because of (1) a divergent or non-overlapping search related to the separate classification of the inventions and (2) the evolution of patentability issues related to searching multiple and distinct inventions.

4. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/23/2006 and 1/29/2010 have been considered by the Primary Examiner.

Specification

Art Unit: 1715

6. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it fails to recite process steps. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

7. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

8. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Art Unit: 1715

Claim Objections

9. Claims 7 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

A. In claim 7, *catalysts* should, apparently, read "catalyst."

B. In claim 16, *saline* should, apparently, read "silane."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 12. Claims 7, 8, and 11-14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 02/16477 A1 in view of EP 1 246 239 A1.
 - A. Claim 7

Art Unit: 1715

i. WO '477 teaches all of the limitations of this claim at 3:1-6; 4:2-9; and 4:16-17, except the presence of latent acid catalysts.

ii. EP '239 teaches the curing of a layer of a composition similar to that disclosed by WO '477 in which latent acid catalysts are utilized to accelerate curing [0080-0081].

iii. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the process of WO '477 so as to utilize latent acid catalysts, motivated by the desire and expectation of accelerating curing.

B. Claim 8

i. While neither of these references expressly teaches more than one layer, it is well known in the art to repeat a coating step in order to build up a coating layer of a desired thickness.

C. Claim 11

See WO '477, claim 3.

D. Claim 12

i. See WO '477, 11:17+.

E. Claim 13

i. EP '239 teaches both thermal and photo latent acid catalysts [0081].

F. Claim 14

i. WO '477 teaches phenyl, see page 10, sixth line from bottom.

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Claims 9 and 15-18 are allowed.

14. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art neither teaches nor suggests the claimed process of forming an antireflective coating characterized in that each layer of organosilicate differs in light

absorption properties from an adjacent layer.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Fletcher III whose telephone number is (571) 272-1419. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy H. Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/549,356

Art Unit: 1715

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Page 7

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William Phillip Fletcher III/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1715

3/27/2011